

supported by substantial evidence and were reached through application of the correct legal standard. *See Coffman v. Bowen*, 829 F.2d 514, 517 (4th Cir. 1987).

In her Objections, the plaintiff reiterates her argument made to the magistrate judge that the administrative law judge improperly relied upon a vocational expert's opinion testimony without recognizing or resolving its conflict with language of the Dictionary of Occupational Titles.

Based upon my careful consideration of the Objections, the record, and the arguments of counsel, and for the reasons stated by the Commissioner in his response, I will overrule the Objections.

Accordingly, it is **ORDERED** as follows:

1. The Report and its findings and recommendations are wholly ACCEPTED and APPROVED; and

2. Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment is DENIED, and Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment is GRANTED.

A final judgment will be entered herewith.

ENTER: September 29, 2020

/s/ JAMES P. JONES
United States District Judge